

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

JOAN HELEN LOVE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:09-CV-736-JCH
	)	
WARREN COUNTY JAIL, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon review of plaintiff's amended complaint [Doc. #20] under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the "court shall review before docketing if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity." The Court is to dismiss the complaint, or any portion, if it is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1974 (2007).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915A, the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

### **The Amended Complaint**

Plaintiff, an inmate at the Warren County Jail, brings this action for monetary relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Named as defendants are Warren County Jail and Sheriff's Department. Plaintiff alleges that defendants violated her constitutional rights in numerous respects and failed to follow "Handbook Policies."

### **Discussion**

Having carefully reviewed plaintiff's allegations, the Court concludes that this action is legally frivolous. Jails and sheriff's departments are not suable entities under § 1983. See Lair v. Norris, 32 Fed. Appx. 175, 2002 WL 496779 (8th Cir. 2002); Alsbrook v. City of Maumelle, 184 F.3d 999, 1010 (8th Cir. 1999)(en banc)(§ 1983 suit cannot be brought against state agency), cert. dismissed, 529 U.S. 1001 (2000); Marsden v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons, 856 F. Supp. 832, 836 (S.D.N.Y. 1994)(jails are not entities amenable to suit); Dean v. Barber, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214-15 (11th Cir. 1992)("[s]heriff's departments and police departments are not usually considered legal entities subject so suit"); McCoy v. Chesapeake Correctional Center, 788 F.Supp. 890 (E.D.Va. 1992)(local jails are not "persons" under § 1983). Moreover, the failure to follow prison guidelines and regulations does not amount to a § 1983 claim. Cf. Bagley v. Rogerson, 5 F.3d 325 (8th Cir. 1993) (allegation of state law violation, statutory or decisional, does not, in itself, state claim under federal Constitution or § 1983).

To the extent that plaintiff is attempting to assert any pendent state claims, they will be dismissed, as well. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3); United Mine Workers v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966) (if federal claims are dismissed before trial, remaining state claims should also be

dismissed); Hassett v. Lemay Bank & Trust Co., 851 F.2d 1127, 1130 (8th Cir. 1988) (where federal claims have been dismissed, district courts may decline jurisdiction over pendent state claims as a "matter of discretion").

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the amended complaint, because it is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

An appropriate order of dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 27th Day of July, 2009.

/s/ Jean C. Hamilton

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE